

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,335,776).

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Baek et al. (US 2002/0140892).

Claims 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 2001/0019388).

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 6,100,953).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are pending for consideration.

Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,335,776). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as being based upon a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24.

Initially, Applicant respectfully requests clarification regarding the exact claims that are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. ('776). Specifically, the

heading of the rejection cites only claim 1, whereas the body of the rejection cites claims 1-8, 10-15, and 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the next Communication from the Office provide a rejection heading that explicitly cites the exact claims that are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. ('776). For purposes of Applicant's Response, Applicant has presumed that at least independent claims 1 and 10 are rejected in view of Kim et al. ('776).

In the event that the next Office Action identifies more than claims 1-8, 10-15, and 18 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. ('776), Applicant respectfully asserts that the next Office Action *may not be made Final* in order to allow Applicant the fair opportunity to properly respond to the rejection of any newly-identified claims.

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19, as amended, all recite a plurality of side electrodes wherein "the side electrode in the pixel being extended to a neighboring pixel." In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Kim et al. ('776) merely discloses a grid formation of auxiliary electrodes that do not extend to a neighboring pixel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kim et al. ('776) fails to teach or suggest a plurality of side electrodes wherein "the side electrode in the pixel being extended to a neighboring pixel," as recited by amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are patentable over Kim et al. ('776).

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Baek et al. (US 2002/0140892), claims 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 2001/0019388), and claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 6,100,953). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully assert that Baek et al., Kim et al. ('388), and Kim et al. ('953) all fail to remedy the deficiencies of Kim et al. ('776), as detailed above. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that Baek et al., Kim et al. ('388), and Kim et al. ('953) all are completely silent with regard to a plurality of side electrodes wherein "the side electrode in the pixel being extended to a neighboring pixel," as recited by amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that combining the teachings of Kim et al. ('766) and Baek et al., Kim et al. ('388), and/or Kim et al. ('953) fails to teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that no combinations of Kim et al. ('766) and Baek et al., Kim et al. ('388), and/or Kim et al. ('953) teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features of amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent

claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell, Esq.
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: April 19, 2005

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000